STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

August 19, 2026
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-05-10
Motion No. 24

Thomas Melone, Esq.
President
Allco Finance Limited
777 West Putnam
Avenue, Suite 300
Greenwich, CT 06830

Re: Docket No. 26-05-10 – Application of CL&P d/b/a Eversource Energy to Amend its Rate Schedules

Dear Attorney Melone:

On August 1, 2026, Allco Finance Limited (Allco) submitted a motion (Motion No. 24) to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority or PURA). In Motion No. 24, Allco requests that the Authority designate it as an intervenor in the above-referenced proceeding. The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource) opposed Allco's participation as an intervenor. Eversource Response to Motion No. 24, Aug. 7, 2026 (Eversource Objection). For the reasons set forth below, Motion No. 24 is granted.

To be designated as an intervenor in a contested case, a person must submit "a written petition to the agency . . . at least five days before the date of hearing," which "demonstrate[s] that the petitioner's participation is in the interests of justice and will not impair the orderly conduct of the proceedings." General Statutes § 4-177a(b). If a person is permitted to intervene, the Authority "will determine the proposed intervenor's participation in the hearing, taking into account whether or not such participation will furnish assistance to the commissioners in resolving the issues of the contested case." Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-18(c). Specifically, the Authority "may limit the intervenor's participation to designated issues in which the intervenor has a particular interest as demonstrated by the petition" and "may further restrict the participation of an intervenor in the proceedings, including the rights to inspect and copy records, to introduce evidence and to cross-examine, so as to promote the orderly conduct of the proceedings." General Statutes § 4-177a(d).

The Authority finds that the participation of Allco is in the interest of justice. Allco is a ratepayer and developer and owner of solar photovoltaic projects in Connecticut.

Motion No. 24, p. 1. The Company indicated that this proceeding "may have a substantial impact on rates, interconnection costs and thus on the development and operation of solar electric generation in Connecticut." Id., pp. 1–2. In this proceeding, the Authority will review and analyze, among other issues, Eversource's cost of service studies and Eversource's proposal to establish a Shared Hosting for Advancement of Renewable Energy program, which contemplates a cost-sharing methodology specifically for substations with long distributed energy resource queues. As such, Allco's interests may be directly impacted by the decision.

Eversource argues that Allco has "fail[ed] to provide a basis on which PURA may distinguish [Allco's] interest as a 'ratepayer' from that of numerous other individual customers of [Eversource]." Objection, p. 5. However, Allco's unique perspective as a solar developer, interconnection customer, and qualifying facility owner may furnish assistance to the Authority.

Eversource additionally argues that Allco's interests are already fully represented in this proceeding by the Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC). Eversource Objection p. 5. While the Authority had designated OCC as a party to this proceeding, as the statutory advocate of "consumer interests" in general, OCC does not exclusively represent the interests of any class or specific type of customers. See General Statutes § 16-2a. Accepting Eversource's argument that Allco's interests are "fully joined and addressed through the participation of the OCC," Eversource Objection, p. 5, would mean that no individual customer should ever be admitted as a party or intervenor in any proceeding in which OCC is also present. Such is not the intent or scope of OCC's statutory responsibilities and representation. See General Statutes § 16-2a. Aside from the fact that OCC must balance the potentially competing interests of the range of consumer interests for which it advocates, individual entities may have specific interests and equities not shared with the various customer groups that OCC represents.

Eversource also argues that Allco's interests are already represented by the Interconnection Customer Coalition (ICC), which the Authority recently designated an intervenor. Eversource Objection, p. 6; see Motion No. 21 Ruling, Aug. 5, 2026. Specifically, since Allco can participate in the proceeding with large solar developers as part of the ICC, Eversource contends PURA should deny Motion No. 24. Id. In response, Allco explains that the members of the ICC are Allco's competitors and, as such, argues "they owe Allco no duty, do not speak for it, and cannot be expected to advance evidence . . . that is unique to Allco." Allco Response to Eversource Objection, Aug. 10, 2026, p. 4. In the Authority's discretion, coincident or overlapping interests may be a valid justification for denying or limiting intervention status. See General Statutes 4-177a(b) and (d); Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-18(c). Here, however, the Authority finds Allco and its interests sufficiently unique to warrant intervention in the interests of justice.

In addition, Eversource argues that Allco's participation would impair the orderly conduct of the proceeding, and appears to support this argument with *ad hominem*

remarks about Allco's litigation activity[1] and a pending petition of misconduct before the Vermont Professional Responsibility Board.[2] The Authority is not persuaded that it would be appropriate to render a preliminary determination that Allco's participation will impair the orderly conduct of proceedings. The Authority may curtail the participation of intervenors during the course of the proceeding, if necessary, to ensure order. See, e.g., General Statutes § 4-177a(d) ("The Presiding Officer may further restrict the participation of an intervenor in the proceedings, including the rights to inspect and copy records, to introduce evidence and to cross-examine, so as to promote the orderly conduct of the proceedings."); Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-40 ("To avoid unnecessary cumulative evidence, the commissioners or the presiding officer may limit the number of witnesses or the time for testimony upon a particular issue in the course of any hearing.").

Accordingly, the Authority designates Allco as an intervenor in this proceeding in accordance with Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-18. With respect to the nature and extent of the participation in the proceeding, Allco is permitted to: receive and review information filed in this docket; participate in the discovery process; submit comments, testimony, and other pleadings; participate in hearings; file briefs and written exceptions; and present oral argument in this proceeding, all on the same dates and at the same times as other docket parties and intervenors.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Motion No. 24 is granted.[3]

By the following commissioner,



Thomas H. Wiehl
Chairman

cc: Service List

---

[1] Eversource points out that "Allco has sued both PURA and [DEEP]" in the past. Eversource Objection, p. 2. Litigation against PURA cannot be a relevant factor for intervenor status consideration, because no potential intervenor should be penalized for exercising their rights to the due process of law. Under Eversource's apparent point of view, its own legal activity could be subject to the same consideration. See, e.g., Connecticut Light and Power Company et al v. Coleman et al., No. 3:2026cv01034 (D.Conn. June 29, 2026); Connecticut Light and Power d/b/a Eversource Energy et al v. Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, Docket No. HHD-CV25-6198559-S.

[2] According to the Eversource' Objection the petition remains pending, and PURA is not persuaded that allegations should be viewed as finalized determinations of malfeasance or indicative of Allco's potential conduct in this proceeding.

[3] This ruling is being issued by the commissioner indicated. A motion for full panel review of this ruling by the commissioners assigned to this docket may be filed within 14 days of this ruling.